

PEARSON, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DUPONT HARRIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

NANCY A. BERRYHILL,
ACTING COMMISSIONER OF
SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

CASE NO. 1:16CV2661

JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON

MEMORANDUM OF OPINION
AND ORDER

An Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) denied Plaintiff Dupont Harris’ application for supplemental security income (“SSI”) after a hearing in the above-captioned case. That decision became the final determination of the Commissioner of Social Security when the Appeals Council denied the request to review the ALJ’s decision. The claimant sought judicial review of the Commissioner’s decision, and the Court referred the case to Magistrate Judge George J. Limbert for preparation of a report and recommendation pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 636](#) and [Local Rule 72.2\(b\)\(1\)](#). On February 1, 2018, the magistrate judge submitted a Report ([ECF No. 16](#)) recommending that the Court affirm the Commissioner’s decision as supported by substantial evidence and made pursuant to proper legal standards. Specifically, the magistrate judge found Plaintiff’s argument that the ALJ erred in assigning no weight to the opinions of Mary Lieders, a certified nurse practitioner (“CNP”), is without merit. [ECF No. 16 at PageID #: 717](#). Next, the magistrate judge found the language of SSR 06-03p, [2006 WL 2329939 \(Aug. 9, 2006\)](#), belies

(1:16CV2661)

Plaintiff's argument that the ALJ did not comply with SSR 06-03p. [ECF No. 16 at PageID #: 719](#). In addition, the magistrate judge found the ALJ did not err when assigning no weight to the opinions of CNP Lieders. [ECF No. 16 at PageID #: 719-20](#). Finally, the magistrate judge found Plaintiff's argument regarding the ALJ's treatment of the opinion of Mitchell Wax, Ph.D. is also without merit. [ECF No. 16 at PageID #: 721](#).

[Fed. R. Civ. P. 72\(b\)\(2\)](#) provides that objections to a report and recommendation must be filed within 14 days after service. Objections to the magistrate judge's Report were, therefore, due on February 15, 2018. Neither party has filed objections, evidencing satisfaction with the magistrate judge's recommendations. Any further review by this Court would be a duplicative and inefficient use of the Court's limited resources. [Thomas v. Arn, 728 F.2d 813 \(6th Cir. 1984\)](#), *aff'd*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); [Howard v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 932 F.2d 505 \(6th Cir. 1991\)](#); [United States v. Walters, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 \(6th Cir. 1981\)](#).

Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge is hereby adopted. The decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is affirmed. Judgment will be entered in favor of Defendant.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

February 20, 2018
Date

/s/ Benita Y. Pearson
Benita Y. Pearson
United States District Judge